REMARKS

Claims 2-11, 14-27 and 30-32 are currently pending in the subject application, and are presently under consideration. Claims 2-7, 10, 11, 14, 16, 17, 19-27 and 30-32 are rejected. Claims 8, 9, 15 and 18 have been indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2, 4, 8, 14, 16, 18, 26-27 and 30 have been amended. Claims 3, 17, 22 and 31 have been canceled.

Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the amendments and comments herein.

I. Interview Summary

Applicant's representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extending during recent telephone interview on August 25, 2006, and on September 20, 2006. During the interview August 25, 2006, independent claims 2, 14, 16, and 25 were discussed relative to U.S. Patent No. 5,181,133 to Lipton. While no specific agreement was reached regarding the allowability of such claims, proposed claim amendments were sent to the Examiner on August 29, 2006, which were discussed during the telephone interview on September 20, 2006. The Examiner agreed that the art of record failed to teach amended claim 14, which is presented herein. The Examiner also expressed a willingness to reconsider the proposed amendment to dependent claim 3, as the art of record did not appear to teach what was set forth in such amended claim. The subject matter of such the proposed amended claim 3 has been incorporated into amended claim 2 by this amendment. Claim 16 has been similarly amended. The following response is written based upon the discussions with the Examiner during the above-mentioned telephone interviews.

II. Rejection of Claims 2, 10, 11, 14, 16, 23-27 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 2, 10, 11, 14, 16, 23-27 and 30-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,181,133 to Lipton ("Lipton") in view of Horn "Basic Electronics" ("Horn"). Applicant's representative traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

Regarding claim 2, claim 2 has been amended to substantially incorporate the subject matter recited in claim 3 with some changes discussed with the Examiner via a telephone interview to make explicit that which was believed to be implicit. Claim 3 was rejected as being made obvious by Lipton taken in view of Horn and in further view of U.S. Patent No.

5,296,756 to Patel et al. ("Patel"). Accordingly, Applicant's representative has considered the teachings of Patel in the response to the rejection of amended claim 2, and in the response to claims depending from amended claim 2.

Lipton taken in view of Horn and in further view of Patel does not teach or suggest a waveform control comprising at least one component coupled to temporarily diode connect a transistor device of a driver, by providing each of a control input node and a second node of the transistor device with a matched voltage, to enable the driver to provide the output signal at an intermediate level for the duration of the first operating node, as recited in claim 2. In rejecting claim 3, which claim 2 has been amended to substantially incorporate, the Office Action admits that Lipton taken in view of Horn is silent on exact construction of a driver circuit, but contends that transistor M1 disclosed in Patel is operated by a diode connection (See Office Action, Page 6). Applicant's representative respectfully disagrees. Patel discloses that drive on-resistance can be controlled by varying a gate voltage of transistor M1 (See Patel, Page 4, Lines 5-7). In amended claim 2, a diode connection is made by providing a control input node and a second node of a transistor device of the driver with a matched voltage. Nothing in Patel teaches or suggests that a gate and any other node of transistor M1 are provided with a matched voltage. Since, Patel does not teach or suggest the diode connection recited in amended claim 2, Lipton taken in view of Horn and in further view of Patel also fails to make amended claim 2 obvious.

Claims 4, 5, 6 and 10-11 depend from amended claim 2 and are not obvious for at least the same reasons as amended claim 2 and for the specific elements recited therein. Accordingly, claims 4, 5, 6 and 10-11 are patentable over the cited art.

Additionally, regarding claim 10, Lipton taken in view of Horn and in further view of Patel does not teach or suggest a precharge device that charges an associated node based on an output signal provided by a driver, the precharge device partially conducts based on an intermediate level of the output signal during the first operating mode, thereby operating as a supplemental keeper to precharge the associated node, as recited in claim 10. In rejecting claim 10, the Examiner contends that the shutter disclosed in Lipton is a precharge device as recited in claim 10, because a liquid crystal is a capacitance device that stores a charge (See Office Action, Pages 4-5). Applicant's representative respectfully disagrees. In FIG. 4 of Lipton, the axis represents zero voltage (See Lipton, Col. 4, Lines 19-20). In rejecting claim 2, from which claim 10 depends, the Office Action contends FIG. 4 of Lipton discloses an intermediate level, which occurs at zero voltage (See Office Action, Page 2). Claim 10

recites that a precharge device partially conducts based an intermediate level. Lipton does not teach or suggest that the disclosed liquid crystals partially conduct at an intermediate level. Instead, Lipton discloses that the liquid crystals are provided with a zero voltage at the level that the Office Action contends is an intermediate level (See Lipton, FIG. 4). Therefore, to suggest that the shutter would partially conduct at the "intermediate level" (i.e., zero volts according to Lipton) is contrary to the teachings of Lipton. For these reasons, claim 10 is patentable over the cited art.

Claim 14 has been amended to recite an integrated circuit chip comprising a waveform control, a delay network, a predriver and a driver. As discussed with the Examiner during a telephone interview on September 20, 2006, amended claim 14 is patentable over the cited art. As discussed with the Examiner, the liquid crystal lenses disclosed in Lipton are not implemented on an integrated circuit chip. Additionally, Applicant's representative respectfully submits that one skilled in the art would not include the liquid crystal lenses taught in Lipton on an integrated circuit chip, since the liquid crystal lenses are part of an eyewear system. Accordingly, Lipton taken in view of Horn does not make claim 14 obvious, and claim 14 is patentable over the cited art.

Regarding claim 16, claim 16 has been amended to substantially incorporate the subject matter recited in claim 17. Claim 17 was rejected as being made obvious by Lipton taken in view of Horn and in further view of Patel. Accordingly, Applicant's representative will include consideration of Patel in the response to the rejection of amended claim 16, and in the response to claims depending from amended claim 16.

As stated above with respect to amended claim 2, Patel does not teach or suggest that transistor M1's gate and source (or other node thereof) are provided with a matched voltage to diode connect M1 consistent with claim 16. Accordingly, Lipton taken in view of Horn and in further view of Patel does not make claim 16 obvious, and claim 16 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 18-21 and 23-24 depends from amended claim 16 and are not made obvious for at least the same reasons as amended claim 16 and for the specific elements recited therein. Accordingly, claims 18-21 and 23-24 are patentable over the cited art.

Claim 25, claim 25 has been amended to make explicit that which was implicit. Moreover, Lipton taken in view of Horn does not teach or suggest a precharge device that charges an associated node based on an output clock signal provided by a driver, the precharge device partially conducts according to an intermediate level of an output clock

during a second operating mode, thereby operating as a supplemental keeper to precharge the associated node during a second operating mode, as recited in claim 25. In rejecting claim 25, the Office Action contends that the liquid crystals disclosed in Lipton read on the precharge device recited in claim 25. Applicant's representative respectfully disagrees. In claim 25, the precharge device partially conducts according to an intermediate level during the second operating mode. In contrast, as stated above with respect to claim 10, Lipton teaches that the liquid crystals are provided with a voltage of zero at the level which the Office Action contends is an "intermediate level". Lipton does not teach or suggest that the disclosed liquid crystals partially conduct at voltage of zero. Accordingly, Lipton taken in view of Horn does not teach or suggest the precharge device recited in claim 25. For these reasons, claim 25 is patentable over the cited art.

Claims 26-27 depend from amended claim 25 and are not obvious for at least the same reasons as amended claim 25 and for the specific elements recited therein. Accordingly, claims 26-27 are patentable over the cited art.

Claim 26 has been amended to make explicit that which was implicit. Amended claim 26 recites an integrated circuit chip comprising a clock generator and at least one circuit. As stated above with respect to claim 14, Lipton does not teach or suggest that the liquid crystal lenses are part of an integrated circuit chip. Since, Lipton taken in view of Horn does not make claim 26 obvious, claims 26 and 27 are patentable over the cited art.

Regarding claim 30, claim 30 has been amended to substantially incorporate the subject matter recited in claim 31. Accordingly, Applicant's representative has considered of the reasons given in the Office Action for the rejection of claim 31 in the response to the rejection of claim 30 and claim 32, which depends from claim 30.

Lipton taken in view of Horn does not teach or suggest means for supplying a charge to a node of associated circuitry based on a clock signal, and means for supplying provides a supplemental charge to the node for a duration that is commensurate with a duration that a clock signal is provided at an intermediate level, whereby evaluation of associated circuitry is facilitated, as recited in claim 31. As stated above with respect to claims 10 and 25, Lipton discloses that the liquid crystals are provided with a voltage of zero at the level which the Office Action contends is an intermediate level. Amended claim 31 recites providing a supplemental charge to a node for a duration that is commensurate with a duration that a clock signal is provided at an intermediate level. It is respectfully submitted that no charge is provided to the liquid crystals disclosed in Lipton when the liquid crystals are provided with

a zero voltage level, which level appears to be the only "intermediate level" shown in Figs. 4-7 of Lipton. Accordingly, Lipton taken in view of Horn does not make claim 31 obvious, and claim 31 is patentable over the cited art.

III. Rejection of Claims 3-7, 17, 19, 20-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 3-7, 17, 19, 20-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipton in view of Horn and in further view of Patel. Applicant's representative traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

As stated above, claims 3, 17 and 22 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 3, 17 and 22 is now moot, or have been otherwise addressed above.

Claims 4-7 depend from amended claim 2 and are not obvious for at least the same reasons as amended claim 2, and for the specific elements recited therein. Accordingly, claims 4-7 are patentable over the cited art.

Claims 19 and 20-21 depend from amended claim 16 and are not obvious for at least the same reasons as amended claim 16 and for the specific elements recited therein. Accordingly, claims 19 and 20-21 are patentable over the cited art.

IV. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8, 9, 15, 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form to include the subject matter of claims 2 and 5. Accordingly, Applicant's representative respectfully submits that claim 8, and claim 9, which depends from claim 8, are allowable.

V. CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant's representative respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicant's representative respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning this paper, the Examiner is invited and encouraged to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at (216) 621-2234, Ext. 106.

No additional fees should be due for this response. In the event any fees are due in connection with the filing of this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Gary J. Pitzer
Registration No. 39,334
Attorney for Applicant(s)

CUSTOMER NO.: 022879
Hewlett-Packard Company
Legal Department MS 79
3404 E. Harmony Road
Ft. Collins, CO 80528